opposite said micromirrors and held a grid potential. Therefore, claim 18 does NOT have all the elements or limitations in Robinson's claim or disclosure.

Applicant's claim 8 is to produce an infrared image on the screen while Robinsons is to produce an image on the screen without the infrared light. The infrared light was filtered out in Robinson's claim. Therefore, Claim 8 is not anticipated by cited Robinson's relevant claim.

Applicant's claim 9 disclosed a method to produce image through ultraviolet light, while Robinson did not use the ultraviolet lights. Therefore, Claim 9 is not anticipated by cited Robinson's relevant claim.

Applicant believes that once the amended independent Claim 1 and new independent claim 18 overcome the 102 (b) rejection, the rest of the claims depending on these two claims should be able to overcome the same 102 (b) rejection.

Applicant believes that all claims, as amended accordingly, are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

S. Alex Lia6

Attorney for Applicant

Reg. No.: 39,463 (408) 280-1999